

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-32 are pending herein.

By this Amendment, claims 18, 23 and 24 have been amended to more fully distinguish the invention of the claims over the teachings of Deguchi cited against these claims.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the original specification and figures. In particular, support for language added to claims 18, 23 and 24 is found at, for example, Fig. 1.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Luu in the January 28, 2004 interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 18-21, 23-27 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,202 (Deguchi). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Deguchi teaches an image processing device and method wherein an ambient light input section, typically comprising one or more than one photosensor, is adapted to detect information on the chromaticity and brightness of ambient light and supplies the obtained

information to the image processing section as information on the viewing environment. See col. 7, lines 11-17. The ambient light input section detects information on the ambient light of the monitor by means of one or more than one photosensors mounted typically on the top of the monitor. See col. 7, lines 52-56.

The image display system as defined by amended claims 18 and 24 includes visual environment detection means remotely located a distance from the image-displayed area and substantially facing the image-displayed area. The image display system as defined by amended claim 23 includes visual environment detection section remotely located a distance from the image-displayed area and substantially facing the image-displayed area.

Deguchi discloses photosensors mounted on the top of the monitor whereas claims 18, 23 and 24 require the detection means to be remotely located a distance from the image-displayed area wherein the detection means substantially faces the image-displayed area.

Thus, as agreed to by the Examiner in the January 28 interview, Deguchi does not describe or suggest the use of a detection means or detection section remotely located a distance from the image-displayed area wherein the detection means or the detection section substantially faces the image-displayed area, as required by claims 18, 23 and 24.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Deguchi fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 18, 23 and 24. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22, 28 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Deguchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 which depends from claim 18. Claim 28 depends from claim 27 which depends from claim 24. Claim 32 depends from claim 31 which depends from claim 23. Each of claims 22, 28 and 32 adds means for displaying an image

that guides to input a type of the screen, and a means for inputting the input type of the screen is at least a part of the environmental information.

Deguchi was cited as allegedly disclosing a graphics user interface (GUI) input means for inputting the viewing environment information. However, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have found Deguchi to teach means for displaying an image that guides to input a type of the screen and means for inputting the input type of the screen as at least part of the environmental information, the presently claimed invention still would not have been achieved. Specifically, as discussed above, Deguchi fails to teach or suggest visual environment detection means or section located a distance from the image-displayed area and substantially facing the image-displayed area. That is, nothing in Deguchi would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to a visual environment detection means or section located a distance away from and substantially facing the image-displayed area.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Deguchi would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claims 18, 23 and 24, or any of depending claims 19-22, 25-28, 31 and 32. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

III. Allowed Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 1, 3-10, 12-17 and 29-30 have been indicated to be allowed.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-10 and 12-32 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel

Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/rav

Date: February 4, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461